

**Remarks**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion.

Entry of this response is requested, as the response places the application in clear condition for allowance or alternatively places the claims in better form for appeal. Specifically, an objected to claim is rewritten in independent form in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, and rejected claims are amended to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 7 are amended.

In the Office Action acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119; and Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Admitted Prior Art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,909,102 to Stone, III, et al. (Stone) and U.S. Patent No. D486,448 to Watanabe et al. (Watanabe).

Initially, Applicants express thanks for the Examiner's allowance of Claim 3.

Applicants express further thanks for the Examiner's indication that Claim 7 recites allowable subject matter, such that the objected to claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response, Claim 7 is so-rewritten. For these reasons, in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, the allowance of Claim 7 is requested.

As stated above acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119. The Office Action summary indicates that "some" of the copies of the certified copies of the priority document have been received from the International Bureau. It is asserted, however, that priority is claimed under 35 U.S.C. § 119 with respect to only Japanese patent application 2000-208984. For these reasons, it is not understood how "some" of the copies could have been received.

It is requested that the Examiner advise Applicants, in the next U.S. Patent Office communication, if the International Bureau has not provided the Examiner with a photocopy of the certified priority document, in accordance with MPEP § 1893.03(c).

As stated above Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Admitted Prior Art in view of Stone and Watanabe. It is asserted that the amendments to the claims overcome the rejection, for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to a receptacle for battery-using apparatuses. Independent Claim 1 recites a contact includes a board connecting portion connected to a circuit board, and an electrode contact portion formed at one tip of a slant strip. At a site extending from the board connecting portion to the slant strip, a vertical strip is disposed along a vertical inner wall surface on a front surface side in a housing space into which the contact is pressured. A void is defined between the board connecting portion and the vertical strip such that a surface of the vertical strip is about perpendicular to a direction in which the vertical strip extends.

The claimed features recited in independent Claim 1 can provide numerous advantages. By way of specific non-limiting examples, by providing the vertical strip with the void and the surface perpendicular to the direction in which the vertical strip extends, a jig or other appropriate tooling can be used to easily insert the contact into the housing space in which the contact is retained, with the contact sliding against the vertical inner wall surface.<sup>1</sup>

It is asserted that none of the Admitted Prior Art, Stone, and Watanabe discloses or renders obvious the claimed features of a void defined between a board connecting portion and a vertical strip such that a surface of the vertical strip is about perpendicular to a direction in which the vertical strip extends, as recited in independent Claim 1. Specifically, it is

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 10, lines 8-13, of the originally filed specification.

asserted that the Admitted Prior Art does not depict or describe the claimed features of the specified void defined between portions of the contact for the battery 104. Stone does not depict or describe the claimed features of the specified void defined between portions of the spring contact 310, for example. Watanabe also does not depict the claimed features of the specified void defined between portions of the contacts of the connector.

For these reasons it is requested that the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of independent Claim 1 is requested.

Claims 2 and 4-6 are allowable for the same reasons as independent Claim 1 from which they depend, as well as for their own reasons. Therefore, it is requested that the rejection of dependent Claims 2 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of dependent Claims 2 and 4-6 is requested.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-7 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Masayasu Mori  
Registration No. 47,301  
Attorney of Record